

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-16, and 18-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended by the present amendment. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at page 20, second paragraph; page 23, third paragraph to page 24, first paragraph).

As amended, independent claims 1 and 7 recite an image sending method and an image sending device, respectively, including "selecting and setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality from a range of applicable resolutions for the selected sending mode, where the applicable resolutions differ depending on the type of sending mode" (independent claim 1; *see also* independent claim 7). Similarly, independent claim 13 has been amended to recite that the processing contents differ depending on the image sending route.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,488,483 to Murayama et al. ("Murayama") in view of U.S. Patent 6,614,551 to Peek. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek does not teach or suggest an image sending method or an image sending device including "selecting and setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality from a range of applicable resolutions for the selected sending mode, where the applicable resolutions differ depending on the type of sending mode" (see independent claims 1 and 7), or where the processing contents differ depending on the image sending route (see independent claim 13).

Murayama teaches the ability to select either the G4 facsimile protocol or color, and also select either standard resolution (200dpi x 200dpi) or precision resolution (400dpi x 400dpi).

In Murayama, the different resolutions (200dpi x 200dpi, 400dpi x 400dpi) are available in both sending modes (G4, color). In other words, the applicable resolution does not differ based on the selected sending mode.

Referring to column 6, lines 1-37 of Peek, as cited in the Office Action of 07/31/2007, a fax machine determines whether a transmission will be a fax transmission or an email transmission by checking for email addresses and fax addresses, as shown in boxes 350 and 360, respectively, of FIG. 4A (see column 6, lines 1-14). In Peek, the fax machine is operable as either a standard fax machine (see column 6, lines 15-16), or as a personal computer for transmitting email (see column 7, lines 24-27).

In other words, Peek merely teaches a fax machine that can be operated in different modes.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek that the applicable resolutions differ depending on the type of sending mode" (see claims 1 and 7), or the processing contents differ depending on the image sending route (see claim 13).

For at least the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek does not teach or suggest an image sending method or an image sending device as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Date: October 31, 2007

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874